DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 851 IR 055 327

AUTHOR Miller, Julie L.
TITLE Name Formation of Victorian Women Writers: A Comparison of Library of Congress Authority Records and Bibliographic Tools.
PUB DATE May 94
NOTE 74p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Authority Control (Information); *Authors; Bibliographic Databases; *Bibliographic Records; Cataloging; Comparative Analysis; *Females; *Humanities; Library Catalogs; Research Needs; Research Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Anglo American Cataloging Rules; Library of Congress; MARC; *Victorian Period

ABSTRACT

This study compared the formation of the names of Victorian women writers in the Library of Congress name authority file to the formation of names in selected bibliographic tools created by humanities scholars. A purposive sample of 52 writers, divided into 12 problem categories derived from Chapter 22 of the "Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules," was searched in four bibliographic tools and the name authority file. A comparison of the variant forms found in the tools and the 100 and 400 fields on MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloging) authority records indicated a significant discrepancy in the formation of names. Forty-one percent of the entries in the tools, representing 45% of the variant forms, did not appear in the 100 or 400 fields of the authority records. It was concluded that further research in the area of authority control of personal names is needed in order to better meet the needs of humanities scholars. Possible solutions to the name discrepancy problem include changing the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations and involving the literary community in the creation of authority records. The appendices contain the data collection sheet and a list of writers included in the study. (Contains nine references.) (DGM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR

ED 376 851

NAME FORMATION OF VICTORIAN WOMEN WRITERS: A COMPARISON OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AUTHORITY RECORDS AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC TOOLS

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Julie L. Miller

May, 1994

IR055227

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. DuMont

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NAME FORMATION OF VICTORIAN WOMEN WRITERS: A COMPARISON OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AUTHORITY RECORDS AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC TOOLS

One step in better serving the information needs of humanities scholars is to compare how well the tools created by library and information professionals correspond to the tools created and used by the humanities scholars. Research indicates the use of personal names is particularly important in humanities research. This study compared the formation of the names of Victorian women writers in the Library of Congress name authority file to the formation of names in selected bibliographic tools created by humanities scholars. A purposive sample of 52 writers, divided into twelve problem categories derived from Chapter 22 of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, was searched in four bibliographic tools and the name authority file. A comparison of the variant forms found in the tools and the 100 and 400 fields on the authority MARC records indicated a significant discrepancy in the formation of names. 41.4% of the entries in the tools, representing 45% of the variant forms found in the tools, did not appear in the 100 or 400 fields of the authority records.

Master's Research Paper by

Julie L. Miller

B.A., Miami University, 1981

M.A., Wright State University, 1986

Ph.D., Ohio University, 1992

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1994

Approved by

Adviser Ischera N. Connell Date April 29, 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES....iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS....v
INTRODUCTION....1
LITERATURE REVIEW....3
METHODOLOGY....5
RESULTS....13
CATEGORY 1....14
CATEGORY 2....16
CATEGORY 3....18
CATEGORY 4....19
CATEGORY 5....21
CATEGORY 6....25
CATEGORY 7....27
CATEGORY 8....27
CATEGORY 9....29
CATEGORY 10....32
CATEGORY 11....35
CATEGORY 12....35
SUMMARY....37
CONCLUSIONS....43
WORKS CITED....47
APPENDIX A....48
APPENDIX B....50

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Findings for Choice among Different Names	15
2.	Findings for Writers Using Pseudonyms	17
3.	Findings for Writers with Separate Bibliographic Identities	20
4.	Findings for Writers with Change of Name	22
5.	Findings for Writers with Names Varying in Fullness or Spelling	24
6.	Findings for Writers with Hyphenated Surnames	26
7.	Findings for Married Women with Compound Surnames	28
8.	Findings for Names with Separately Written Prefixes	30
9.	Findings for Writers Using Titles of Nobility	31
10.	Findings for Writers Using Initials or Phrases	34
11.	Findings for Names with British Terms of Honor	36
12.	Findings for Writers Using Married Term of Address	38
13.	Summary of All Categories of Names	39

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to thank Dr. Tschera Harkness Connell for suggesting the problem investigated in this paper and for acting as advisor. Thanks also to Dr. Linda C. Smith and Dr. Mary Kim for making suggestions for the design of the project.

Introduction

Research indicates that humanities scholars are particularly dependent upon libraries for research. "Libraries provide access to reports of other people's research in every academic discipline, but in the humanities they may also provide access to the starting point of research, the raw materials" (Stone, 1982, 300). Stone identifies two methods of research among humanities scholars. Whether humanities scholars begin research by conversing with colleagues or by examining primary materials, searching secondary materials and browsing library holdings are important steps in the research process (296). In an analysis of humanities indexes Wiberley (1988) found that "singular proper terms [personal names] constitute more than half of the substantive vocabulary . . . of the humanities" (3). Therefore authority control of personal names is particularly important for library users doing research in the humanities.

One step in better serving the information needs of humanities scholars is to compare how well the tools created by library and information professionals correspond to the tools created and used by the humanities scholars. This descriptive study compares a purposive sample of names of Victorian women writers in the Library of Congress Name Authority File (LC NAF) to the names as they appear in four bibliographic tools created by literary scholars.

The names of Victorian women writers were chosen for two reasons. With the advent of feminist scholarship, many writers of this period are being rediscovered. Their works are being read by a new generation of scholars, critics, and students. As a result, more secondary works in the form of monographs, journal articles, and reference tools are being created. The canon of British literature is in flux, and access to both past

and current literature is essential for Victorian scholarship.

Secondly, the names of Victorian women writers pose special problems for the researcher. Although many Victorian women claimed authorship as a vocation rather than an avocation, Victorian culture was still very patriarchal. Many women separated their work in the private sphere (home) from that of the public sphere (publication) through the use of alternate names. Publishing was a business dominated by men; some women chose to write under male or androgynous pseudonyms in order to have access to the privileges of male authorship. Consequently many of these women writers were known by more than one name, including a given name, a married name, a pseudonym, or an abbreviated form. The researcher may come to the library catalog with a different form of name than that which is used by the catalog.

The *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, Second Edition, 1988 Revision (AACR2) provides a meaningful basis for comparing the names. Chapter 22 states the rules for determining the headings for personal names. These rules were used in the construction of the Library of Congress authority records. In this study the rules were used to derive twelve categories of problems relevant to determining the correct form of name for Victorian women writers.

The purpose of this study was to discover the differences between the names of Victorian women writers as constructed for the uniform heading of LC name authority records and as constructed in representative reference tools created by scholars of Victorian literature. The writers were placed in twelve problem categories based on the reason for a possible discrepancy. Where a difference existed, the study examined the cross references made in the LC name authority record to determine whether the record provides adequate access to the name.

Literature Review

Research relevant to this study falls into two principal areas, authority control and information needs of humanities scholars. No research specifically examines authority control of personal names as it pertains to British literary scholarship, but some of findings in indexing for the humanities are helpful.

Many works discuss the importance of authority control in the finding and gathering functions of the library catalog. Clack (1990) describes its importance in the case of personal authorship when the author has used more than one name, especially in the creation of cross references to lead the user to the correct heading. She describes the process by which name authority records are created and used by the cataloger:

> An authority record for a name is created only once, that is, at the time a name has been identified as new to the public catalog, no matter how frequently the same name reappears as an access point on subsequent bibliographic records. At each subsequent appearance of the name, it is checked against the authority file for verification that the name is new to the catalog. The presence of a record in the authority file negates the name as being new; therefore, no new authority record is created for it. (36)

Clack also provides guidelines in making references from variant names and forms of name to the preferred name. Her categorization of conditions for creating references includes categories relevant to the names of Victorian women writers, including: the name is different from the heading; the name is in a significantly different form; the name is a compound name with parts as likely points of access (107-108).

Much has been written about the need for authority control (especially in an online environment), but few studies discuss the efficacy of the LC

NAF as a link between the user and the catalog. Fuller (1988) studied the "extent to which persons' names appear in different forms in their works and . . . the types of differences among the forms of those names that do appear in more than one way" by sampling the card catalog at University of Chicago (79). She found that 81.5% of all persons in the catalog used only one form of name. Where more than one form was used, the most common point of difference was the entry element for the name. Smith (1990) compared periodical titles as they appear in electronic databases with the titles as they appear in the online catalog of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and OCLC. Since the databases are compiled by indexers and abstracters who are not necessarily using AACR2 rules for name construction, discrepancies occur, especially in forms of foreign language titles and international corporate bodies (56). The results have not yet been published, but in a personal interview Smith indicated a need for librarians to act as "translators" of information from electronic databases to the library catalog.

In describing the role of LC NAF in the online environment, Kellough (1988) remarks on a few inconsistencies, but describes it as "the only comprehensive resource for authority control" (5). More has been written about conducting searches in online databases in the humanities. Everett and Pilachowski (1986), for example, suggest search strategies for searching personal names in humanities databases. Such studies do not, however, describe the process by which the database user can take her findings from the database to the library catalog, an area particularly important to the humanities scholar.

Research in the information needs of the humanities scholar is growing. In her 1982 survey of research on information needs and uses of humanities scholars, Stone describes the research as "fragmented" and

patchy. She summarizes by stating, "The literature on the whole does not provide librarians with clear guidelines as to how they should proceed in terms of meeting the needs of humanities scholars" (306). Over ten years later, several sessions of the 1993 annual conference of the American Society for Information Science were devoted humanities issues, indicating the field is responding to this gap in the literature.

One study in indexing in the humanities is particularly relevant to the questions explored here. Wiberley (1988) conducted a study to identify differences in terms used in subject access across the humanities based upon the precision of the terms. He selected representative humanities indexes, took random samples of the subject terms used, and placed them into categories based on the precision of the terms in time and space. The subject terms in the literature indexes analyzed were comprised of 89 to 93% singular proper terms (personal names). Wiberley concludes that "high quality authority work," including careful cross references, is essential for these terms (25-26).

Methodology

The process of comparing the names of these writers as they appear in the LC authority records and in representative reference tools created by literary scholars included the following steps: selecting the tools; deriving the problem categories from AACR2 Chapter 22; identifying writers and placing them in the problem categories; searching the names in the bibliographic tools; searching the names in the LC NAF; repeating the process for those categories with fewer than two writers; analyzing and compiling the data.

A pilot study was conducted using the names of five Victorian women writers who had married and who were known by more than one name. The process facilitated the design of a data collection sheet (see Appendix A).

The data collection sheet included three primary areas of information. The first area included general information such as the writer's name, the problem category to which she was assigned, the source of the initial reference to the writer, and the LC authority record number. The second area was a grid. On the left side of the grid was space for eight variant forms of names. Each tool and the 100 and 400 fields of the machine-readable record (MARC) from the authority file were assigned columns on the right, allowing a checkmark to be placed in the appropriate column for each variant form of name. The 100 field of the MARC authority record provides the uniform heading; the 400 fields provide cross references from unused headings. The third area included space for notes and for deriving the LC search keys.

This first step was to select the reference tools used to represent the work of humanities scholars. The tools were chosen based on two criteria:

1.) The tool must have been created by scholars within the field of literature, not by information professionals using AACR2 1988. There would have been no basis of comparison between LC NAF and tools created using AACR2. The preface, introductory notes, or statements of responsibility for each tool were used to determine whether this criterion was met.

2.) The tool had to be a standard resource within the humanities, one that a researcher might very well use as a finding aid. The section on nineteenth-century British literature in Literary Research Guide, second edition, was used to determine whether this criterion was met.

The date of publication of the tool was not considered to be relevant; some definitive texts, such as the Dictionary of National Biography, were

published by 1988 (the year AACR2 was revised), but are still important tools of literary scholarship. A researcher may use a name from these older resources. Format of the tool (print or online) was not considered to be relevant. Differences in forms of names impair searches in either print or electronic media.

Using these criteria, the following resources were chosen to serve as the basis for comparison with LC NAF:

Annual Bibliography of Victorian Studies (print, years 1988-1992)

Dictionary of National Biography and its *Missing Persons* supplement

A Checklist of Women Writers, 1801-1900: Fiction, Verse, Drama

MLA International Bibliography (CD-ROM)

Both the *Annual Bibliography of Victorian Studies* (ABVS) and the *MLA International Bibliography* are annual indexes of publications in selected areas of the humanities. The *Dictionary of National Biography* (DNB) is a standard biographical source, while *A Checklist of Women Writers* attempts to list editions of works by women published in 1801-1900 and held in the British Library.

Chapter 22 of AACR2 1988 was used to provide a meaningful basis of comparison. Because the purpose of this chapter is to state the rules for constructing the uniform heading of a personal name, it presents a comprehensive list of problem areas. Library of Congress Rule Interpretations for Chapter 22 were consulted to clarify the intent of the rules, but they were not fundamental to deriving the problem categories. This study focuses on the how well the authority records provide references, not on how well the authority records correspond to the rules.

In deriving problem categories most relevant for the names of Victorian women writers, rules having to do with languages other than English were omitted, as were rules having to do with titles other than titles of British honor, including religious titles. Relatively few names in the population of Victorian women writers fall under these rules.

Fourteen problem categories were derived from Chapter 22 of AACR2. They fell into three groups:

Choice among different names

1. choice among different names
2. pseudonyms
3. separate bibliographic identities
4. change of name
5. different forms of the same name (fullness or spelling)

Choice of entry elements

6. compound surnames
7. hyphenated compound surnames
8. surnames with separately written prefixes
9. entry under titles of nobility
10. entry under initials or letters
11. entry under phrase

Choice of additions to names

12. British terms of honor
13. terms of address of married women
14. additions to distinguish identical names (dates, fuller forms).

During the course of the data collection, category 14 was eliminated due to lack of data. Additionally, categories 10 and 11 were combined because they were found to overlap. Writers using initials also frequently used

phrases to identify themselves. These changes resulted in twelve problem categories. More detailed information about each category is included in the discussion of results.

For each problem category a purposive sample of two to five Victorian women writers whose names posed the problem described in the category was searched. For the purposes of this study, Victorian women writers are those British women who wrote in the genres of fiction, poetry, personal writing (e.g. correspondence, diaries), nonfiction (e.g. conduct books, travelogues), and journalism between the years 1837 and 1900. Their writings need not have been published during those years but must have been published subsequently. Additionally, the writers must have been the subject of some scholarly investigation and discourse; otherwise their names were not used in the tools. As many variant forms of the name as possible were identified in order to assist in the subsequent search procedures.

The initial contact with the writers' names came from a variety of sources, including a personal collection of Victorian fiction and three volumes in a series titled *Bibliographies of Writings by American and British Women to 1900*. The initial source for the names was not deemed important; a researcher in the humanities may find a citation in a variety of sources, including journal articles, discussion with colleagues, and primary texts. A researcher may seek more information by turning to finding aids such as the standard bibliographic tools chosen for this study.

A range of two to five writers for each problem category was set for two reasons. Using five writers for each category enhanced the probability of finding at least two examples for each category in the LC NAF. Since Library of Congress does not focus on literature in its collection, many writers may be excluded from its authority file.

Secondly, searching at least two examples for each category helped to determine whether there was a significant discrepancy between the names as they appeared in the tools and LC NAF.

Assigning writers' names into the problem categories required some judgment; because of the variety of names and forms of names used by these writers, their names frequently fell into more than one category. For example, Lady Georgiana Fullerton (terms of honor) was also known as Lady Georgina Fullerton (variant spelling), and Georgiana Charlotte Leveson-Gower (hyphenated surname). Biographical sources such as the *Dictionary of National Biography* and *British Women Writers: A Critical Reference Guide* were used to determine the appropriate problem category. The decision was based upon which problem area seemed most crucial for determining the uniform heading for the individual writer's name(s).

The process of searching the bibliographic tools included searching each tool under all of the known variants until an entry was found for the writer. For example, when an entry for a writer was found in the 1992 volume of the *Annual Bibliography of Victorian Studies*, the 1988-91 volumes were not then searched; preceding entries for the writer would take the same form.[1] Each writer's name(s) was searched in all four tools; variant names and forms of name were recorded on the data collection sheet. Notes such as dates of birth and death, titles of significant works, and page numbers and/or entry numbers were also recorded to aid in subsequent searches. If an entry for a writer was not found in at least

[1] By its nature, the *DNB* includes only one entry per writer. A key word searches in the *MLA International Bibliography* CD-ROM and a random check of previous entries in the *Annual Bibliography of Victorian Studies* found no variant entries for the same author from year to year. Variant forms were found, without cross reference, in the *Checklist of Women Writers;* therefore all known variants for the writers were searched in this tool.

one of the bibliographic tools, the writer was discarded from the study.

The names of writers found in at least one of the bibliographic tools were then searched in the Library of Congress Name Authority File. The authority file MARC records are composed of fields of information. Variable fields are assigned tags, or three-digit identifying numbers. The 100 field of the MARC authority record presents the uniform heading for the personal name as constructed by Library of Congress based on Chapter 22 of AACR2. The 400 field(s) present headings that are not established headings and therefore not used in the catalog. In the catalog cross references are made from these forms to the established form presented in the 100 field. A 500 field indicates another established heading that is somehow related to the heading established in this record; this type of heading results in a "see also" reference in the catalog. Additionally, fields are divided into subfields separated by delimiters. Each delimiter determines the type of information to be presented in the subfield it precedes.

When an authority record was found for a writer, the record was printed. Variant forms of names were recorded on the data collection sheet; forms previously found were given a checkmark in the appropriate column (100 or 400 fields). In order to receive a checkmark, the match had to be exact in fullness (including terms of address), order, and spelling. Variations in punctuation (such as the use of parentheses) were disregarded. The exception was in the use of a hyphen because it could significantly affect the way a name is entered in the tools or searched in the catalog. Information included in subfields preceded by delimiters c (terms of address and titles) and q (fuller forms) in the 100 and 400 fields of the authority record was considered relevant. Information occurring after delimiter d (birth and death dates) was not considered a

substantive part of the heading.

The names of eighty-six writers were searched in the bibliographic tools. Of these writers twenty-three were not found in any of the four bibliographic tools; they had to then be excluded from the study because there was no basis for comparison with the LC name authority records. Names of the remaining sixty-three writers were searched in the LC authority file. The LC NAF included records for forty of those writers. After the number of writers per category was assessed, five categories were found to be lacking enough names to make a viable comparison. One category (additions to distinguish names) was deleted. Discrepancies between variant forms in this category were not considered impediments to finding the entries; the basis of comparison was inconsequential. The categories for entry under initials and entry under phrases were combined due to overlap in the names falling into those categories. An additional fifteen writers were assigned to the remaining three categories, searched in the bibliographic tools, and searched in the LC NAF. Of those writers, twelve were found in both the tools and the LC NAF, resulting in a final purposive sample of fifty-two writers in twelve problem categories. Appendix B lists the fifty-two writers, the bibliographic tool(s) in which their names were found, and the LC authority record numbers.

In analyzing the data, the first point of comparison was between the variant form(s) found in the bibliographic tools and the 100 field of the LC MARC authority record, or the established heading. If the form(s) found in the tools did not match the 100 field exactly, the form(s) was compared to the 400 field(s) of the authority record. For each writer tallies were made for the number of entries in the tools, the number of variants in the tools, the matches between the tools and the 100 and 400 fields, and the number of variants unique to the LC records as well as to the tools. The

tallies were then added for each category and percentages computed.

Results

The names of fifty-two Victorian women writers were searched in the four bibliographic tools and the Library of Congress Name Authority File. The names were placed in twelve problem categories derived from Chapter 22 of the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2). In the following discussion, each category will be defined and search results presented. In both the tables and the discussion, *variant* refers to a unique presentation of a name. *Entry*, on the other hand, means any reference to the writer. For example, if all four bibliographic tools referred to a writer, four entries were made. If they all used the same name to refer to the writer, the four tools used one variant. In order to indicate in the tables the number of entries from the tools that matched the 100 field, a fraction was used. For example, if three out of four entries matched the 100 field, the fraction 3/4 was given. To total a column, the numerators of the fractions were totaled and presented above the totaled denominators. The column marked "Total variants" in the tables indicates the total number of unique presentations found in the bibliographic tools, the authority record, and any other source.

Problem Categories for Choice of Name.

The following five problem categories are derived from AACR2 (1988 revised) rules 22.1A through 22.3D. These rules provide guidelines for establishing the heading when given a choice of names for the same person. The general rule for these problem categories is 22.1A, which directs the librarian to "choose . . . the name by which [the author] is commonly known," whether that name is a real name, a pseudonym, a nickname, or initials (381). Rule 22.1B directs the librarian to use the chief sources of information of works by the author issued in his or her

own language to determine the commonly known name.

The use of the chief sources of information may cause discrepancies between the name chosen for the authority record and the name used in bibliographic tools. While the librarian uses the chief source(s) in the actual works, the literary scholar may choose the name traditionally used in the literary canon. The name by which a writer is known one hundred years after she published her work may not be the same name under which the works were published.

Category 1: Choice of Name

Rule 22.2A directs the librarian to choose the most commonly known name when a person is known by more than one name (other than a pseudonym). If one name is not clearly the most common, the librarian should use the following guidelines, in order of preference, to establish the name:

a) the name that appears most frequently in the person's works

b) the name that appears most frequently in reference sources

c) the latest name (AACR2 383-384)

This rule corresponds to the general rule for choice of name (22.1), which also indicates common usage as the basis for establishing the name.

The names of five writers were searched for this problem category. These were writers known by more than one name (other than a pseudonym) or more than one form of the same name. Table 1 summarizes the findings of the search. The names appeared in the bibliographic tools eleven times in eight variant forms. Five of the entries (45.5%) matched the 100 field of the

Table 1
Summary of findings for choice among different names

	# entries in tools	# variants in tools	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # variants	Variants only in LC	Variants only in tools
Byron, May Clarrisa (*also* Gillington, May Clarissa)	1	1	no (0/1)	yes (1/1)	6	4	0
Carlyle, Jane Welsh	2	2	yes (1/2)	yes (1/2)	6	2	0
Gaskell, Elizabeth Cleghorn	4	2	yes (3/4)	yes (1/4)	4	2	0
Kemble, Fanny	3	2	yes (1/3)	yes (2/3)	5	0	0
Montagu, Eleanora Louisa	1	1	no (0/1)	yes (1/1)	7	3	0
Totals	11	8	5/11 45.5%	6/11 54.5%	28	11/28** 39.3%	0 0%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matching the designated MARC field and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.

** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.

LC authority records for the writers. All six of the remaining entries matched 400 fields in the LC records. Therefore a researcher who uses the names from the tools to search the library catalog will use the correct heading or will find a cross reference to the correct heading 100% of the time. This category represents the ideal situation for the researcher.

A total of 28 variants were found for the names of these five writers. Eleven of the 28 (39.3%) were unique to the LC authority records; none of the variants found in the tools were not also found in the authority records.

Category 2: Pseudonyms

This category is based on AACR2 rules 22.2B1, 22.2B2, and 22.2B4.[2] Rule 22.2B1 directs the librarian to choose the pseudonym as the authoritative name if all of the works by that person appear under one pseudonym. 22.2B2 directs the librarian to establish separate headings for persons with more than one clearly established bibliographic identity; cross references should be used to refer from one heading to another. If separate identities are not clearly established and the author is not contemporary, rule 22.2B4 tells the librarian to "choose . . . the name by which that person has come to be identified in later editions of his or her works, in critical works, or in other reference sources (in that order of preference)" (AACR2 386).

The names of five Victorian women writers who used pseudonyms were searched. Table 2 summarizes the findings in this category. These writers appeared in the bibliographic tools a total of eleven times in a total of six variant forms, so there was a high degree of consistency in the tools themselves. None of the tools used the pseudonym as the chosen

[2] Rule 22.2B3 refers to contemporary, not past, writers using pseudonyms.

Table 2
Summary of findings for writers using pseudonyms

	# entries in tools	# var-iants in tools	Pseudo-nym used in tools?*	Pseudo nym usd in LC ?	Entry in tool matches LC 100 ?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # var-iants	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools
Bronte, Charlotte (Currer Bell)	4	1	no (0/4)	no	yes (4/4)	N/A	8	6	0
Currie, Mary Montgomerie Singleton, Baroness (Violent Fane)	1	1	no (0/1)	yes	no (0/1)	yes (1/1)	4	3	0
Fox, Sarah Hustler (Sphinx)	1	1	no (0/1)	yes	no (0/1)	yes (1/1)	3	2	0
Irvine, Mary Catherine (Aura)	1	1	no (0/1)	no	yes (1/1)	N/A	2	1	0
Webster, Augusta (Cecil Home)	4	2	no (0/4)	no	yes (3/4)	no (0/4)	5	2	1
Totals	11	6	0%	2/5 40%	8/11 72.7%	2/11 18.2%	22	14/22** 63.6%	1/6*** 16.7%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matched and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.

** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.

*** Numerator represents # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

17

name. In two of the five authority records, on the other hand, the pseudonyms appeared in the 100 field of the authority record.

In eight of the eleven instances (72.7%) the names appearing in the bibliographic tools match the 100 fields of the authority records. Of the remaining three instances in which the writers appear in the bibliographic tools, two of the names (18.2%) match the 400 fields of the authority records. Therefore, a researcher using the names of these five writers as they appear in the bibliographic tools will find or be directed to the correct name in the catalog 90.9% of the time. In one entry (9.1%), the name does not appear in either the 100 or 400 fields of the authority record.

The total number of variant names found for these writers was twenty-two. Of the twenty-two variants, fourteen variants (63.6%) were found in the LC authority records but not in the bibliographic tools.

Category 3: Separate Bibliographic Identities

According to rule 22.2B2, a person has established separate bibliographic identities if she has written one type of work using one name and another type of work using another name. For example, Marian Evans published philosophical pamphlets and translations before she submitted her first novel as George Eliot. While Eliot's separate bibliographic identities are well known in the literary discipline, the same is not true of other women writers who wrote under different names. "See also" references are very important for scholars who may not be aware their subject of study wrote in a different genre under a different name. Because it may be difficult to determine whether a writer had actually established separate bibliographic identities, biographical tools were used in deciding whether to place names in this category.

The rule 22.2B2 directs the librarian to establish separate headings for each body of work, using "see also" references to show the relationship between them.

The names of four writers were searched for this problem category; Table 3 summarizes the findings. Interestingly, none of the four writers had additional records for their additional identities, as would have been indicated by a 500 field in the LC MARC authority record. Perhaps this lack is due to the general rule for a predominant name, or perhaps to the last sentence in rule 22.2B2: "In case of doubt, do not consider a person to have separate bibliographic identities" (AACR2 384).

Entries for the writers appeared in the bibliographic tools eleven times in eight variant forms. Four of the eleven entries (36.4%) matched the LC 100 fields; one of the remaining entries (9.1%) matched the 400 field. A researcher using the names of these four writers as they appear in the bibliographic tools will find or be directed to the correct name in the catalog only 45.1% of the time.

Of the twenty-four variant forms found for the names of these writers, eleven (45.8%) were found only in the LC records. Three of the eight variants (37.5%) found in the tools did not match either the 100 or 400 fields.

Category 4: Change of name

Rule 22.2C1 applies to a person (other than one using a pseudonym) whose name has changed. The rule states that the later form of name should be chosen for a person who has changed her name, "unless there is reason to believe that an earlier name will persist as the name by which the person is better known" (386). The examples given in AACR2 include women whose names have changed due to marriage and persons whose names have changed due to acquiring a title of nobility.

Table 3
Summary of findings for writers with separate bibliographic identities

	# entries in tools	# var-iants in tools	Entry under sep. IDs in LC ?	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # var-iants	Var-iants only in LC	Var-iants only in tools
Clarke, Mary Cowden (*also* Shortfellow, Henry Wandsworth)	2	1	no	no (0/2)	no (0/2)	4	1	1
Eliot, George (*also* Evans, Marian, and Cross, Mary Ann)	4	2	no	yes (3/4)	yes (1/4)	10	6	0
Hobbes, John Oliver (*also* Craigie, Pearl Mary Teresa)	2	2	no	yes (1/2)	no (0/2)	3	1	1
Somerville, Edith (*also* Somerville and Ross, and Geilles, Herring)	3	3	no	no (0/3)	no (0/3)	7	3	1
Totals	11	8	0 0%	4/11 36.4%	1/11 9.1%	24	11/24** 45.8%	3/8*** 37.5%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matching the designated MARC field and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.

** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.

*** Numerator represents # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

The names of five women writers, all of whom had a change of name due to marriage, were searched for this problem category. Table 4 summarizes the findings. Of the eight times the five writers appeared in the bibliographic tools, none of the entries used the later names. By contrast, the LC authority records used the later name in the 100 field for four of the five writers.

In only one instance (12.5%) did an entry in a bibliographic tool match the 100 field of the LC record. Five of the eight instances (62.5%) matched 400 fields in the LC MARC records. A total of six of the eight entries (75%) of the writers' names as they appear in the bibliographic tools, then, were accounted for by the 100 and 400 fields in the LC MARC authority records. Two of the entries in bibliographic tools (25%) do not appear in either the 100 or 400 fields of the authority records; therefore, a scholar using these names to search the library catalog will not find cross references to the correct headings.

The total number of variant forms found for these five writers was twenty-eight. Of the twenty-eight variants, sixteen (57.1%) were found in the LC MARC authority records but were not found in the tools. Two of the twenty-eight (7.1%) were found in the tools but not in the authority records.

Category 5: Choice Among Forms of Same Name (Fullness, Spelling)

This category combines rules 22.3A and 22.3D. Both of these rules provide guidelines for choosing between different forms of the same name. Rule 22.3A concerns forms that vary in fullness and directs the librarian to "choose the form most commonly found. . . . If no one form predominates, choose the latest" (387). If the librarian is not sure which form is the latest, she is directed to choose the fuller or fullest form.

Table 4
Summary of findings for writers with change of name

	# in tools	# var-entries in tools	Entry under later iants in tools?	Entry under later name in LC ?	Entry in tool name LC 100 ?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total matches var-iants	Var-iants # in LC	Var-iants only only in tools
Alexander, Cecil Frances (*earlier* Humphreys, Cecil Frances)	1	1	no	yes	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	6	2	1
Belloc, Bessie Rayner (*earlier* Parkes, Bessie Rayner)	1	1	no	yes	no (0/1	yes (1/1)	2	1	0
Bishop, Isabella Louisa (*earlier* Bird, Isabella Louisa)	1	1	no	no	yes (1/1)	N/A	10	8	0
Craik, Dinah Maria (*earlier* Mulock, Dinah Maria)	3	1	no	yes	no (0/3)	yes (3/3)	4	2	0
Crosland, Camilla Dufour (earlier Toulmin, Camilla Dufour)	2	2	no	yes	no (0/2)	yes (1/2)	6	3	1
Totals	8	6	0%	4/5 80%	1/8 12.5%	5/8 62.5%	28	16/28** 57.1%	2/6*** 33.3%

*. In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matching the designated MARC field and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.

** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.

*** Numerator represents # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

22

Rule 22.3D concerns variant spellings of the same name:

> If variant spellings of a person's name are found . . . choose the form resulting from an official change in orthography, or, if this does not apply, choose the predominant spelling. In case of doubt, choose the spelling found in the first item catalogued. (391)

The names of five writers were searched in this category. Table 5 summarizes the findings. The five writers appeared in the bibliographic tools a total of seven times in five variant forms. In four of the seven entries (57.1%) the names as they appeared in the bibliographic tools matched the 100 fields of the authority records. One of the seven (14.3%) matches the 400 field. A researcher using the names as they occur in the bibliographic tools will find or be directed to the uniform heading 71.4% of the time. Two of the seven (28.6%) entries do not appear in either the 100 or 400 fields of the LC MARC authority records.

The search found a total of fourteen variants for these five writers. Eight of the fourteen (57.1%) were found in the authority records but not in the tools. Two of the fourteen (14.3%) were found in the tools but not in the authority records.

Problem categories for choice of entry element

Once a name is chosen as the heading for a person, the librarian must determine the entry element, or "the part of the name under which the person would normally be listed in authoritative alphabetic lists" (AACR2 392). Categories 6-10 are based on problems in choosing the entry element for headings of personal names. They are all governed by general rule 22.4, which directs the librarian to determine the entry element according to usage in the writer's language or country of residence or activity, unless the writer's preference is known to be different.

Table 5
Summary of findings for women writers with names varying in fullness or spelling

	# entries in tools	# var-iants in tools	Entry in tool matches LC 100 ?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # var-iants	Var-iants only in LC	Var-iants only in tools
Barber, M.A.S. (Barber, Mary Ann Serrett)	1	1	no (0/1)	yes (1/1)	2	1	0
Bowman, Hetty (Bowman, Henrietta)	1	1	yes (1/1)	N/A	2	1	0
Corbett, Miss (Corbet, Miss)	1	1	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	4	3	1
Gascoigne, Caroline Leigh (Gascoyne, Caroline Leigh)	1	1	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	4	3	1
Mitford, M.R. (Mitford, Mary Russell)	3	1	yes (3/3)	N/A	2	0	0
Totals	7	5	4/7 57.1%	1/7 14.3%	14	8/14** 57.1%	2/5*** 40%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matching the designated MARC field and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.

** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.

*** Numerator represents # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

Rules 22.4B1-22.4B4 provide order and punctuation guidelines. Rule 22.5 designates the surname as the entry element unless subsequent rules dictate otherwise.

Category 6: Hyphenated Surnames

Many compound surnames are hyphenated. Users of the library catalog may be confused whether to search under the last element of the surname or the first element of the surname. The confusion increases if, as is often the case, the name is not hyphenated consistently when it appears in the literature or in the bibliographic tools. Rule 22.5C3 directs the librarian to enter the name under the first element of the hyphenated surname. Hyphens are also sometimes used to join a prefix to a surname. Rule 22.5C directs the librarian's attention to a related rule, 22.5E1, for hyphenated prefixes. The rule states that if a prefix is regularly or occasionally hyphenated the name should be entered under the prefix (400).

The names of five writers with hyphenated surnames were searched for this category; Table 6 summarizes the findings. The writers had seven entries in the tools in seven variant forms. While all of the authority records entered the name under the first element of the compound surname, only four of the entries in the tools (57.1%) were under the first element.

One entry (14.3%) in the bibliographic tools matched the LC MARC record 100 field; none of the entries matched the 400 fields. As a result, six of the seven entries in the tools, or 85.7%, did not correspond to the authority records at all. A total of twenty-five variant forms was found; fourteen of them (56%) were found only in the LC records. Six of the twenty-five variants, or 24%, were unique to the tools.

Table 6
Summary of findings for names of writers with hyphenated surnames

	# entries in tools	# var-iants in tools	Entry under first element in tools?*	Entry under first element in LC ?	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # var-iants	Var-iants only in LC	Var-iants only in tools
Childe-Pemberton, Harriet Louisa	1	1	no (0/1)	yes	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	5	3	1
Fitz-simon, Ellen	1	1	yes (1/1)	yes	yes (1/1)	N/A	2	1	0
Gore-Booth, Eva	2	2	yes (1/2)	yes	no (0/2)	no (0/2)	5	3	2
Hume-Rothery, Mary Catherine (*also* Hume, Mary Catherine)	1	1	yes (1/1)	yes	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	5	3	1
Stuart-Wortley, Emmeline	2	2	yes (1/2)	yes	no (0/2)	no (0/2)	8	4	2
Totals	7	7	4/7 57.1%	100%	1/7 14.3%	0/7 0%	25	14/25** 56.0%	6/7*** 85.7%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matched and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.
** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.
*** Numerator represents # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

Category 7: Married Women with Compound Surnames

Rule 22.5C5 provides guidelines for choosing the entry element for married women with compound surnames consisting of a name before marriage and their husband's surname. A well-known example of such a name is Elizabeth Barrett Browning, whose name was Elizabeth Barrett before her marriage to Robert Browning. For names in English, the entry element is the husband's surname.

As indicated in Table 7, the names of three writers were searched for this category. The writers had nine entries in the bibliographic tools in six variant forms. All three of the LC authority records entered the names under the husbands' surnames in the 100 fields, but only seven of the nine entries in the tools were under the husbands' surnames.

Six of the nine entries (66.7%) in the bibliographic tools matched the 100 fields of the LC MARC authority records. Of the remaining three entries in the tools, one (11.1%) matched a 400 field in the authority record. A researcher using the names as they occur in the bibliographic tools will find or be directed to the correct heading seven out of nine times (77.8%).

A total of seventeen variants for the three writers were found. Nine variants (52.9%) were unique to LC authority records. Two of the seventeen variants (11.8%) were unique to the bibliographic tools. They represent one-third of the variants found in the tools.

Category 8: Names with Separately Written Prefixes

When a surname has a separately written prefix, the librarian must choose the entry element for the name. Rule 22.5D provides guidelines for choosing the entry element based upon the writer's "language or country of residence or activity" (AACR2 396). For British writers the rule prescribes entry under the prefix.

Table 7
Summary of findings for married women with compound surnames

	# entries in tools	# var-iants in tools	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Entry under husband's name in tools?*	Entry under husband's name in LC ?	Total # var-iants	Var-iants only in LC	Var-iants only in tools
Browning, Elizabeth Barrett	4	2	yes (3/4)	no (0/4)	yes (3/4)	yes	7	3	1
Burnett, Frances Hodgson	3	2	yes (2/3)	no (0/3)	yes (3/3)	yes	8	6	1
Ellis, Sarah Stickney	2	2	yes (1/2)	yes (1/2)	yes (1/2)	yes	2	0	0
Totals	9	6	6/9 66.7%	1/9 11.1%	7/9 77.7%	100%	17	9/17** 52.9%	2/6*** 33.3%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matched and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.
** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.
*** Numerator represents # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

The names of two writers were searched for this category; Table 8 summarizes the findings. Four entries in two variant forms were found in the bibliographic tools; all of them were entered under the prefixes. The LC MARC authority records also entered the names in the 100 fields under the prefixes. The two forms of the names matched the 100 fields of the LC records exactly. A researcher using the names as they appear in the tools will find the correct heading in the catalog 100% of the time.

A total of four variants were found for the writers' names. Two of the variants (50%) were unique to the LC authority records. The bibliographic tools included no unique variants.

Category 9: Entry Under Title of Nobility

When a person has a title of nobility, the librarian must choose whether to make an entry under the person's surname or under the title of nobility. For British women writers, titles of rank include *duchess*, *marquess* or *marchioness*, *countess*, *viscountess*, and *baroness*. Rule 22.6A directs the librarian to enter the name under the title of nobility if the person is commonly known by that title. This rule applies to writers who write under their titles rather than their personal names or to persons listed by their titles in reference sources. The entry should take this form: the proper name in the title, followed by the personal name in direct order, concluding with the term of rank. For example, the entry for Elizabeth Yorke, Countess of Hardwicke, should read:

Hardwicke, Elizabeth Yorke, Countess of

Rule 22.6B1 directs the librarian to exclude a territorial designation in a title of nobility unless it is integral to the title.

The names of four writers were searched for this category. Five entries with a total of five variant forms were found in the bibliographic tools. None of these writers were entered under their titles of nobility in

Table 8
Summary of findings for names with prefixes written separately

	# entries in tools	# var-iants in tools	Entry by prefix in tools ? *	Entry by prefix in LC 100?	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # var-iants	Var-iants only in LC	Var-iants only in tools tools
D'Arcy,Ella	3	1	yes (3/3)	yes	yes (3/3)	N/A	2	1	0
De Humboldt, Charlotte	1	1	yes (1/1)	yes	yes (1/1)	N/A	2	1	0
Totals	4	2	4/4 100%	100%	4/4 100%		4	2/4** 50%	0 0%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matched and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.
** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.

Table 9
Summary of findings for writers using titles of nobility

	# entries in tools	# variants in tools	Entry by title in tools ? *	Entry by title in LC 100?	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # variants	Variants only in LC	Variants only in tools
Colchester, Elizabeth Susan Law Abbott, *Baroness*	1	1	no (0/1)	no	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	14	10	1
Dacre, Barbarina Brand, *Baroness*	1	1	no (0/1)	yes	no (0/1)	yes (1/1)	7	5	0
Dufferin and Clandeboye, Helen Selina Blackwood, *Baroness*	2	2	no (0/2)	yes	no (0/2)	yes (1/2)	8	5	1
Hardwicke, Elizabeth York, *Countess of*	1	1	no (0/1)	yes	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	6	3	1
Totals	5	5	0%	3/4 75%	0%	2/5 40%	35	23/35** 65.7%	3/5*** 60%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matched and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.
** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.
*** Numerator represents # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

the bibliographic tools. Three of the four LC MARC authority records, on the other hand, entered the name under the title of nobility in the 100 fields. Obviously, the bibliographic tools and the authority records treated the names. None of the five entries in the tools matched the LC MARC 100 fields. Two of the five (40%) matched the 400 fields. A researcher using the names as they occur in the bibliographic tools will find or be directed to the correct heading two out of five (40%) times.

A total of thirty-five variants (from six to fourteen variants per writer, with an average of 8.75 variants per writer) were found for these four writers. Twenty-three of the variants (65.7%) were unique to the LC authority records. Three of the five variants found in the bibliographic tools (60%) were unique to the tools. They represent 8.6% of the total variants found.

Category 10: Names Entered As Initials or Phrases

Many writers have published under initials or phrases rather than under their own names or pseudonyms. Rules 22.10 and 22.11 provide guidelines for choosing the entry element for writers commonly known by initials or phrases rather than by name. Rule 22.10 states

> Enter a name consisting of initials, or separate letters, or numerals, or consisting primarily of initials, under those initials, letters, or numerals in direct order. (405)

It further directs the librarian to include any typographical devices, words, or phrases associated with the initials.

Rules 22.11A-D give guidelines for entry under a phrase. If a writer is commonly known by another name, that name should be used instead of the phrase. If the phrase is chosen as the uniform heading, the general rule is to enter under the phrase in direct order unless the name has the

appearance of a forename and surname or consists of a forename with a term of address (such as *Cousin Fannie*).

Table 10 summarizes the findings for searching the names of five writers who used initials and/or phrases. The writers appeared in seven entries in six variant forms in the bibliographic tools. In only one instance was a writer listed under her initials; none of the tools listed the writers under a phrase. Two of the five writers were entered by their initials in the 100 fields of the LC MARC authority records. None of the entries from the tools (0%) matched the 100 fields; five out of the seven entries (71.4%) from the tools, however, matched 400 fields in the records. Therefore, a researcher using those entries will be directed to the established heading 71.4% of the time.

A total of seventy-three variant forms were found for these five writers, ranging from three to thirty variants per writer. Sixty-one of the seventy-three variants (83.6%) were unique to the LC MARC authority records. Of the six variants found in the tools, two of them (33.3%) were unique to the tools. They represent 2.7% of the total number of variants found.

Problem Categories for Additions to Names

Even after a name and its entry element are chosen as the authoritative form of name for an author, the librarian may have to decide whether to make certain additions to the name and how those additions are to appear. AACR2 rules 22.12-22.16 provide guidelines for making additions to names. This study includes two problem categories based on this section of Chapter 22 of AACR2. These categories were included to discover any discrepancies between the use and placement of additions to names in the bibliographic tools and their use and placement in the LC authority records.

Table 10
Summary of findings for writers usings initials or phrases

	# entries in tools	# var-iants in tools	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # var-iants	Var-iants only in LC	Var-iants only in tools
Agnew, Eleanor C. (*also* E.C.A., and Author of Geraldine)	1	1	no (0/1)	yes (1/1)	8	6	0
Lewis, Emma (*also* E.L.)	1	1	no (0/1)	yes (1/1)	3	2	0
Gore, Catherine Grace Frances (*also* Authoress of Mothers and Daughters)	2	1	no (0/2)	yes (2/2)	21	17	0
Tucker, Charlotte Marie (*also* A.L.O.E., and A Lady of England)	2	2	no (0/2)	yes (1/2)	30	27	1
Whitney, Adeline Dutton Train (*also* A.D.T.W., and Author of Boys at Chequasset)	1	1	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	11	9	1
Totals	7	6	0%	5/7 71.4%	73	61/73** 83.6%	2/6*** 33.3%

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matching the designated MARC field and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.

** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.

*** Numerator represent # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

Category 11: British Terms of Honor

Rule 22.12B directs the librarian to add a British term of honor (*Dame* or *Lady*) if the term commonly appears with the name in works by the author or in reference sources. The term should follow the forename if "the person is entered under given name or . . . is the wife of a baronet or knight" (408). It should precede the forename if the author is "a dame of the order of the British Empire or of the Royal Victorian Order . . . or a daughter of a duke, duchess, marquess, marchioness, earl, or countess" (408).

As Table 11 indicates, the names of five writers were searched for this category. They appeared in fifteen entries, with a total of fifteen variants, in the bibliographic tools. This high number of variants suggests the literary community has not agreed upon a single form of name for any of these writers. Twelve of the entries in the tools included a term of honor, but the tools did not necessarily agree upon the placement of the terms. Four of the five LC MARC 100 fields included the terms of honor. Two of the fifteen entries found in the tools (13.3%) match the LC 100 fields. One of the fifteen entries (6.7%) matched an LC 400 field. A researcher using the names as they occur in the bibliographic tools will find or be directed to the established heading three out of fifteen times (20%). This percentage is extremely low.

A total of thirty-four variants were found for these five writers. Seventeen of the variant forms (50%) were unique to the LC authority records. Twelve of the fifteen variants (80%) found in the tools were unique to the tools; they represent 35.3% of the total number of variants.

Category 12: Terms of Address of Married Women

Many writers, such as Mrs. Samuel Carter Hall and Mrs. Henry Wood, used their husbands' names in their publications. In these cases, they

Table 11
Summary of findings for names using British terms of honor

	# entries in tools	# var-iants in tools	Title used in tools ? *	Title used in LC 100?	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # var-iants	Var-iants only in LC	Var-iants only in tools
Barker, Mary Ann, *Lady*	2	2	yes (1/2)	no	no (0/2)	no (0/2)	6	4	2
Fullerton, Georgiana, *Lady*	4	4	yes^^ (4/4)	yes	yes (1/4)	no (0/4)	6	2	3
Morgan, *Lady* Sydney	4	4	yes^^ (3/4)	no	no (0/4)	no (0/4)	13	8	4
Ritchie, Anne Thackeray, Lady	3	3	yes^^ (2/3)	no	no (0/3)	yes (1/3)	7	3	2
Stuart, Louisa, *Lady*	2	2	yes^^ (2/2)	yes	yes (1/2)	no (0/2)	2	0	1
	15	15	12/15	2/15	4/5	1/15	34	17/34**	12/15***
Totals			80%	13.3%	80%	6.7%		50%	80%

^^ tools disagree in placement of term of honor

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matched and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.

** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.

*** Numerator represent # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

added the term of address *Mrs.* to distinguish themselves from their husbands. Rule 22.15B directs the librarian to "add the term of address of a married woman if she is identified only by her husband's name" (410). The example in AACR2 places the term after the surname and before the forename:

Ward, *Mrs.* Humphrey

In the 100 field of the MARC record, however, the term of address follows the entire name and is preceded by delimiter c:

Ward, Humphrey, ±c Mrs.

The names of four writers were searched for this category. As Table 12 indicates, the writers appeared in nine entries in six variant forms in the tools. Two of the variants in the tools (33.3%) used the husbands' names with the terms of address for married women; all of the 100 fields of the LC MARC authority records did so. Only one of the nine entries from the tools (11.1%) matched an LC MARC 100 field. One other (11.1%) matches an LC MARC 400 field. A researcher using the names as they occur in the bibliographic tools will find or be directed to the established heading two out of nine times (22.2%).

A total of fifteen variant forms were found for these four writers. Nine of the fifteen (60%) were unique to the LC MARC authority records. Four of the six variants found in the tools (66.7%) were unique to the tools; they represent 26.7% of the total number of variants.

Summary of Findings

The names of a total of fifty-two writers were searched and found in both the selected bibliographic tools and the Library of Congress Name Authority File. Table 13 summarizes the findings. 319 variant forms were found for the names of the fifty-two writers. This averages to 6.1 variant forms per writer. Of those 319 variants, eighty (25.1%) were

Table 12
Summary of findings for writers using term of address *Mrs.* with husband's name

	# entries in tools	# variants in tools	Entry uses term in tools ? *	Entry uses term in LC 100?	Entry in tool matches LC 100?*	Entry in tool matches LC 400?*	Total # variants	Variants only in LC	Variants only in tools
Burton, Charles Henry, *Mrs.*	1	1	yes (1/1)	yes	yes (1/1)	N/A	1	0	0
Hall, S.C., *Mrs.* (*also* Hall, Anna Maria)	3	2	yes (1/3)	yes	no (0/3)	no (0/3)	4	2	2
Riddell, J.H., *Mrs.* (*also* Riddell, Charlotte Eliza)	1	1	no (0/1)	yes	no (0/1)	no (0/1)	5	4	1
Wood, Henry, *Mrs.* (*also* Wood, Ellen, and Price, Ellen)	4^^	2	no (0/4)	yes	no (0/4)	yes (1/4)	5	3	1
Totals	9	6	2/9 22.2%	100%	1/9 11.1%	1/9 11.1%	15	9/15** 60%	4/6*** 66.7%

^^ Mrs. Wood appears twice in *Checklist of Women Writers*, as Ellen Wood and as Ellen Price, with no cross references.

* In this column numerators represent # of entries in tools matched and denominators represent total # of entries in tools.
** Numerator represents # variants unique to LC MARC record, and denominator represents total variants found in tools, LC MARC record, and initial sources.
*** Numerator represents # variants unique to tools, and denominator represents total variants in tools.

Table 13
Summary of searches for all categories

	# writers searched	# variants found	# variants in tools	Entry in tool matches LC 100 ?	% of entries	Entry in tool matches LC 400?	% of entries	Total % matching entries	Variants only in LC	Variants only in tools
Category 1 (Choice of name)	5	28	8	5	45.5%	6	54.5%	100.0%	11	0
Category 2 (Pseudonyms)	5	22	6	8	72.7%	2	18.2%	90.9%	14	1
Category 3 (Bibliographic identities)	4	24	8	4	36.4%	1	9.1%	45.5%	11	3
Category 4 (Change of name)	5	28	6	1	12.5%	5	62.5%	85.0%	16	2
Category 5 (Fullness/spelling)	5	14	5	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	71.4%	8	2
Category 6 (Hyphenated surnames)	5	25	7	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	14.3%	14	6
Category7 (Compound surnames)	3	17	6	6	66.7%	1	11.1%	77.8%	9	2

Table 13 (continued)
Summary of searches for all categories

	# writers searched	# variants found	# variants in tools	Entry in tool matches LC 100 ?	% of entries	Entry in tool matches LC 400?	% of entries	Total % matching entries	Variants only in LC	Variants only in tools
Category 8 (Separate prefixes)	2	4	2	4	100.0%	N/A	N/A	100.0%	2	0
Category 9 (Titles of nobility)	4	35	5	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	40.0%	23	3
Category 10 (Initials/phrases)	5	73	6	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	71.4%	61	2
Category 11 (Terms of honor)	5	34	15	2	13.3%	1	6.7%	20.0%	17	12
Category 12 (Terms of address)	4	15	6	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	22.2%	9	3
Totals	52	319	80	36	34.6%	25	24.0%	58.6%	195	36

found in the bibliographic tools in a total of 104 entries. 195 of the 319 variants (61.1%) were unique to the LC MARC authority records. This percentage is not surprising; the librarians who create the authority records work from the chief sources of information of the works themselves. They encounter more variant forms for each writer, and they are directed to make cross references based on AACR2 rules. Thirty-six of the 319 variants (11.3%) were unique to the bibliographic tools. This percentage became more dramatic when the number of variants unique to the tools was divided by the total number of variants found in the tools. Of the eighty variants found in the tools, thirty-six are unique. *Therefore, 45% of the variant forms as they occurred in the tools were not found in the authority records.*

Of the 104 entries in the bibliographic tools thirty-six (or 34.6%) matched the 100 fields of the authority records. In other words, the bibliographic tools and the LC MARC authority record agreed on the correct heading approximately one-third of the time. An additional twenty-five entries in the tools (24.0%) matched the 400 fields of the LC MARC authority records. This number is surprisingly low; one would expect more of the headings established by literary tradition (or used in these standard literary tools) to be referenced in the authority records.

One possible explanation for the low percentage suggests that the variants found in the 400 fields for the MARC records are not of the sort scholars use. Some are made up of initials and phrases, their variations and inversions. For example, Charlotte Marie Tucker wrote under the phrase A Lady of England, the initials A.L.O.E., and phrases such as Author of Adopted Son. For each of these variants the authority record provides a direct-order reference and an inverted reference. Thus A.L.O.E. appears in the 100 field, while E., A.L.O. appears in a 400 field, and so on. These

references are explicitly ordered by rules 22.10 and 22.11 of AACR2.

They are not, however, variants that are likely to appear in the bibliographic tools. A total of sixty-eight variants unique to the LC MARC records were composed of initials and phrases, their variants and inversions. They represent 34.8% of all variants unique to the LC MARC records; they represent 21.3% of the total number of variants found. In other words, over one-fifth of all the variant forms found and over one-third of the variants unique to the LC MARC records were of these types. A great deal of effort, therefore, is going into making cross references that are not likely to be used by scholars searching the library catalog.

A total of sixty-one of the 104 entries, or 58.6% , from the bibliographic tools are accounted for in the 100 and 400 fields of the authority records. The catalog of a library using the LC NAF as a basis for authority control may provide the chosen heading and cross references to that heading for the writers included in this study an average of 58.6% of the time. These entries represented forty-four variant forms.

The first group of problem categories had a much better average than 58.6%. The categories focusing on choice of name among different names, twenty-two of forty-eight entries (45.8%) matched the LC MARC 100 fields and fifteen (31.2%) matched the LC MARC 400 fields, for a total of 77%. Category 1 (choice among different names) matched 100%, while Category 3 (separate bibliographic identities) only matched five out of eleven entries (45.4%).

The categories that focused on entry element had a total of thirty-two entries in the bibliographic tools. Only eleven of those entries (34.4%) matched the LC MARC 100 fields, while another eight (25%) matched the 400 fields. On average, 59.4% of the entries in the tools were accounted for in the authority records. These categories varied a great deal in their

performance, however. The entries for Category 8 (separately written prefixes) matched 100% (the names of only two writers were searched). Category 6 (hyphenated surnames) had a very low performance, with only one of seven entries (14.3%) matching either the LC 100 or 400 fields.

The group of categories with the worst average performance focused on additions to names. Only five of twenty-four entries in the tools (20.8%) matched the 100 and 400 fields for these two categories. Overall, there was great disagreement among the bibliographic tools as to the forms of names; this disagreement was also reflected in the comparison between the tools and the authority records.

Whether one looks at the percentage of entries (41.4%) or the percentage of variants (45%) found in the bibliographic tools but not represented in the LC authority records, the numbers are discouraging. In more than four times out of ten, a researcher using a name exactly as it occurs in one of these basic bibliographic tools will not find or be directed to the correct name in the library catalog.

Conclusions

Many of us working in library and information science have a growing interest in meeting the needs of humanities scholars. One step is to compare how well the tools created by library and information professionals correspond to the tools created and used by the humanities scholars. This study contributes to the knowledge of the field by making one such comparison. Although this purposive sample was small compared to the total number of Victorian women writers, it indicates a need for further research in the area of authority control of personal names in the humanities.

Based on the findings in this study, one may assert there is a significant discrepancy between the names of Victorian women writers as

they are represented in these four bibliographic tools and the names as they appear in the Library of Congress Name Authority File. A quantitative study using a larger, random sample of names of Victorian women writers would provide more conclusive evidence of a significant discrepancies. A study of the search strategies of Victorian scholars, perhaps using the logs of author searches on the online catalog, may indicate whether the problems of authority control of Victorian women writers are as significant to scholars as is suggested by the findings in this study.

Studies using other types of names within British or American literature would also provide more evidence of problems in name authority control. This study could be duplicated using difference bibliographic tools or using names from other time periods or from other branches of the humanities. Such duplication would give us a better idea of the depth and breadth of problems in name authority control in the humanities.

It is also possible to assert that the syndetic structure of the LC NAF is inadequate in providing cross references from the forms of names used in the bibliographic tools to the heading used in the library catalog. One possible explanation for the inadequacy lies in how the headings, in both the authority records and the tools, are determined. Clearly, the LC authority records are based upon the chief sources of information in the primary texts themselves, as directed by AACR2. Librarians use reference tools to determine headings only as a last resort.

Humanities scholarship, on the other hand, does not provide a single set of guidelines for determining the form of names for its subjects. Literary tradition may be the greatest determining factor in selecting the form of name in tools created by humanities scholars. For writers such as George Eliot, Charlotte Bronte, and Elizabeth Barrett Browning there is little discrepancy; their works have been well established in the literary canon.

For "secondary" writers and for those writers who are being rediscovered, however, no single form of name has been established by literary tradition. Where the number of variants was as high as the number of entries in the bibliographic tools, there was a greater rate of disagreement between the tools and the authority records.

Certain types of problems also seemed to indicate a greater possibility for discrepancies. Problem categories having to do with elements in addition to the personal name, such as Category 6 (entry under title of nobility), Category 11 (British terms of honor), and Category 12 (terms of address for married women) had the highest rates of discrepancy. Forms varied according to whether the additions were included as well as to how they were placed. Further research in additions to names and their placement is indicated. A study as to how (or whether) scholars use these additions in their search strategies would help to determine the types of references that need to be made in the catalog.

What is the solution for improving the authority control for the names of Victorian women writers? One possibility lies in changing the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRIs). If the findings of this study are confirmed by further studies, the Library of Congress could consider changing interpretations for Chapter 22 to reflect the weaknesses in the authority records. For example, the interpretations for Rules 22.6 (titles of nobility) and 22.12 (British terms of honor)could direct the librarian to use a reference source earlier in the process of establishing the heading. The LCRIs could also recommend that references made from inversions of initials and phrases be eliminated, if further research indicates that few library users actually search the catalog using those headings.

Another possible solution is to involve the literary community in the creation of authority records. A library (or libraries) with significant

collections in Victorian studies, or universities with prestigious Victorian scholars on faculty, could act as the primary source(s) of authority records for Victorian women writers. The scholars who edit and create the standard bibliographic tools may be willing to act as resources for the librarians performing authority work in this area. An increased dialog between the literary community and authority librarians is bound to improve the quality of the authority records and therefore the catalog's usefulness.

Works Cited

Clack, Doris Hargrett. 1990. Authority control: Principles, applications, and instructions. Chicago: American Library Association.

Everett, David, and David M. Pilachowski. 1986. What's in a name?: Looking for people online--humanities. Database 9: 26-34.

Fuller, Elizabeth E. 1989. Variation in personal names in works represented in the catalog. Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 9: 75-95.

Gorman, Michael, and Paul W. Winkler, eds. 1988. Anglo-American cataloguing rules. 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association.

Harner, James L. 1993. Literary research guide: A guide to reference sources for the study of literatures in English and related topics. 2nd ed. New York: Modern Language Association.

Kellough, Patrick H. 1988. Name authority work and problem solving: The value of the LC name authority file. Technicalities 8: 3-5.

Smith, Linda C. 1990. Toward integration of online resources. In Annual Review of OCLC Research July 1989-June 1990. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Online Computer Library Center.

Stone, Sue. 1982. Humanities scholars: Information needs and uses. Journal of Documentation 38: 292-313.

Wiberley, Jr., Stephen E. 1988. Names in space and time: The indexing vocabulary of the humanities. Library Quarterly 58: 1-28.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION SHEET

Problem category _____

Name _____

Initial source _____

LC ARN # _____

Variant forms:	AB Victorian Studies	DNB	DNB — Missing Persons	Checklist & Writers	MLA		LC 100 Field	LC 400 Field	Search
1.									[. .
2.									[. .
3.									[. .
4.									[. .
5.									[. .
6.									[. .
7.									[. .
8.									[. .

Notes:

APPENDIX B:

A LIST OF WRITERS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

Appendix of Victorian Women Writers Used in Study

Name	Problem Category	LC ARN#	Bibliographic Tools
Agnew, Eleanor C.	10	959530	Checklist
Alexander, Cecil Frances	4	1386740	Checklist
Barber, M.A.S	5	1635336	Checklist
Barker, Mary Anne, Lady	11	96799	MLA, Checklist
Belloc, Bessie Rayner	4	1660624	Checklist
Bird, Isabella	4	65368	ABVS
Bowman, Hetty	5	3402835	Checklist
Bronte, Charlotte	2	287252	all*
Browning, Elizabeth Barrett	7	300721	all
Burnett, Frances Hodgson	7	392265	ABVS, DNB-MP,MLA
Burton, Charles Henry, Mrs.	12	2795474	Checklist
Byron, May Clarissa	1	68494	Checklist
Carlyle, Jane Welsh	1	67804	ABVS, MLA
Childe-Pemberton, Harriet Louisa	6	847949	Checklist
Clarke, Mary Victoria Cowden	3	87495	Checklist, MLA
Colchester, Elizabeth LawAbbott, Baroness	9	2728303	Checklist
Corbett, Miss	5	2741712	Checklist
Craik, Dinah Maria Mulock	4	289325	DNB,MLA, Check.
Crosland, Camilla Dufour	4	899540	DNB, Checklist
Currie, Mary Montgomerie Singleton, Baroness	2	832976	Checklist
Dacre, Barbarina, Lady	9	909724	Checklist
D'Arcy, Ella	8	1088122	ABVS, MLA, Checklist
De Humboldt, Charlotte	8	945917	Checklist
Dufferin and Clandeboye, Helen Selina Blackwood	9	860712	DNB, Checklist
Eliot, George	3	278899	all
Ellis, Sarah Stickney	7	1879826	DNB, Checklist
Fitz-simon, Ellen	6	864078	Checklist
Fox, Sarah Hustler	2	3325572	Checklist
Fullerton, Georgiana, Lady	11	859052	all
Gascoigne, Caroline Leigh	5	2751315	Checklist
Gaskell, Elizabeth Cleghorn	1	392650	all
Gore, Catherine Grace Frances	10	881635	DNB, MLA
Gore-Booth, Eva	6	1971711	DNB-MP,Checklist

Hall, Anna Maria	12	288435	DNB, MLA, Checklist
Hardwicke, Elizabeth Yorke, Countess of	9	847593	Checklist
Hervey, Eleanora Louisa Montagu	1	2730675	Checklist
Hobbes, John Oliver	3	98935	ABVS, Checklist
Hume-Rothery, Mary Catherine	6	2732164	Checklist
Irvine, Mary Catherine	2	1258395	Checklist
Kemble, Fanny	1	80842	ABVS, MLA, Check
Lewis, Emma	10	3260418	Checklist
Mitford, M.R.	5	68811	DNB,MLA,Checklist
Morgan, Sydney Owenson, Lady	11	322435	ABVS, DNB, MLA
Riddell, Charlotte	12	868622	Checklist
Ritchie, Anne, Lady	11	89614	ABVS, MLA, Checklist
Somerville, Edith	3	945693	ABVS, MLA, Checklist
Stuart, Louisa, Lady	11	1518521	ABVS,MLA
Stuart-Wortley, Emmeline, Lady	6	881634	DNB, Checklist
Tucker, Charlotte Maria	10	882282	ABVS,Checklist
Webster, Augusta	2	914320	all
Whitney, Adeline Dutton Train	10	2217867	MLA
Wood, Ellen	12	98324	DNB, MLA, Checklist

*Charlotte Bronte is found in the Missing Persons volume of the DNB.